		Application No.		Applicant(s)	
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summ	mary	09/950,094		PACKER ET AL.	
	ai y	Examiner	ر اما	Art Unit	
		Monica A Fontaine	W/	1732	
All Participants:		Status of Applica	tion:		
(1) Monica A Fontaine.		(3)			
(2) Nancy Johnson.		(4)			
Date of Interview: 27 September 2004		Time:			*
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes If Yes, provide a brief description:		nt's representative)			
Part I.					
Rejection(s) discussed: n/a					
Claims discussed: n/a				· .	
Prior art documents discussed: n/a				·	
Part II.					
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING TH See Continuation Sheet	E GENER	RAL NATURE OF WH	IAT WAS	DISCUSSED:	
Part III.					
 ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a sedirectly resulted in the allowance of the application of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a sedid not result in resolution of all issues. A brief 	ation. The eparate re	examiner will provid	e a writte e of the i	n summary of the nterview, since	ne substance
			,		
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (A	Applicant/	Applicant's Represen	tative Sig	nature – if appro	opriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Ms. Johnson (from attorney's office) called the examiner to inquire as to why claim 33 was not indicated allowable on the correspondence received by applicant. Upon review, the examiner noted a typographical error on the "Notice of Allowability" and in the Office Action. On these two papers, claim 33 was not included as an allowed claim. However, on the File Wrapper Issue Information (not sent to applicant), Claim 33 was included as an allowed claim. Therefore, the examiner is sending this correspondence with the corrected allowed claim listing and reasons for allowance.